PROLEGOMENA TO A GREEK-HEBREW AND HEBREW-GREEK INDEX TO AQUILA*

BY JOSEPH REIDER, Dropsie College.

INTRODUCTION

1. THE Oxford Concordance to the Septuagint an d the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament by Hatch and Redpath, completed in 1897 [1] and with its two supple ments in 1906,[2] follows a double plan with regard to the two

* [The Indexes to which allusion is made in the present wo rk have been completed and the manuscript has been deposited in the Library of Dropsie College. Another student in the Biblical Department of the College is engaged in preparing similar Indexes to Theodotion, and it is hoped that the work of indexing Symmachus and the other translators recorded in the Oxford Concordance, as well as the Hexaplaric matter found in Field but not excerpted in the Concordance, will be shortly undertaken by members of the College. All these Indexes when completed will be issued in one volume, which it is hoped will be welcomed by scholars as a useful supplement to Hatch and Redpath.—Professor Margolis has appended a few notes in brackets signed with the initial M.]

1 *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament* (*including the apocryphal books*), by Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, assisted by other scholars. 2 vols. Oxford, 1897.—Hatch and Redpath have been preceded by Konrad Kircher *Concordantiae V[is] T[i] Graecae, ebraeis vocibus respondentes* πολυχρησται, Frankf. a. M., 1607, 2 vols.; Abraham Tromm, *Concordantiae graecae versionis, vulgo dictae LXX interpretum, cujus voces secundum ordinem elementorum sermonis graeci digestae recensentur.* Amsterdam, 1718. 2 vols. ; G. M[orrish], *A Handy Concordance of the LXX.* London, 1887. Mention must also be made of J. F. Schleusner, *Novus Thesaurus philologico-criticus sive lexicon in LXX.* London, 1829. In the last-named work there are found instructive observations which I have turned to good purpose.

2 Fasc. I containing a concordance to the proper names occurring in the

main sources upon which it is based.   In the case of the
Septuagint, under every word the citations for all the
passages in which the word occurs are given with ' as far
as possible enough of the context to show (1) the gram-
matical construction of the word, (2) the words with which
it is ordinarily associated '.³   At the head of each article
an alphabetically arranged list of Hebrew (Aramaic) equi-
valents is found, to which throughout the article reference
is made by number.⁴   This plan has been deviated from in
case of numerals, prepositions, and conjunctions : instead
of full citations we have merely an index of passages, and
furthermore the Semitic equivalents are not given.   This
latter method has been followed throughout for the ' other '

Septuagint.   Oxford, 1900.   Fasc. II containing a concordance to Eccle-
siasticus, other addenda and Hebrew index to the whole work.   Oxford,
1906.

    ³ Preface, p. v, end. The editor goes on to say : ' But to have combined
in each quotation all its points either of grammatical interest or of analogy
with other passages would have made the work inordinately long : and
consequently it will frequently be found that the quotations under a single
word are made on different principles in order to illustrate different points
relating to it.'

    ⁴ For a criticism of the arrangement of the work, cp. Margolis, 'Entwurf
zu einer revidierten Ausgabe der hebräisch-aramäischen Äquivalente in der
Oxforder Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of
the Old Testament,' *ZAW.*, XXV (1905), pp. 311 ff.; see also Smend,
Griechisch-Syrisch-Hebräischer Index zur Weisheit des Jesus Sirach.   Berlin,
1907, pp. x ff.   Both Margolis and Smend object to the quid pro quos or
unidentified Greek words marked by a dagger, claiming that this lack of
identification impairs the usefulness of the work for lexical purposes and
textual criticism.   Smend, furthermore, considers altogether impractical
the arrangement of the Greek citations according to the order of the books
of the Bible and not (as Tromm) according to the Hebrew equivalents.   He
also considers it unfortunate that the Hebrew index contained in the second
Supplement gives reference to the pages in which the Greek equivalents
occur and not to the equivalents themselves [similarly Glaue-Rahlfs, *Frag-
mente e. griech. Übersetzung d. samarit. Pentateuchs*, 52.   M].

Greek versions.[5]   Both for the Septuagint and the other versions certain pronouns and particles of frequent occurrence have been omitted altogether, such as, for example, καί and the definite article ὁ, ἡ, τό.[6]

2. The work to which the following pages are introductory is intended to supplement Hatch-Redpath on the sides in which the editors have left room for improvement. While the Oxford Concordance has been taken as a basis for a new double index, Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek, to Aquila, who heads the list of the 'other' versions, it has been sought to supply two main deficiencies. In the first place references are given also for words of frequent occurrence omitted in the Oxford work.[7] In the second place every article contains the Hebrew (Aramaic) equivalents both for the articles found and those not found in Hatch-Redpath. The need for a registration of these equivalents has been felt by all students of the Greek versions. In giving these equivalents it has been deemed advisable to deviate from the method adopted by the Oxford editors. The equivalents are presented not in alphabetical order, but with regard to frequency. Another feature is

---

[5] Smend, *l. c.*, considers this as one of the weak points in the Concordance.

[6] Cp. Schmiedel, *Georg Benedict Winer's Grammatik des neutestament-lichen Sprachidioms*[8], Göttingen, 1894, p. xv. Schmiedel not only criticizes the omission of certain prepositions and particles in the Concordance, but also the failure to reproduce the whole phrase in connexion with the prepositions and particles, for ' es kann doch keinen Augenblick zweifelhaft sein, dass hier das Ausschreiben des Textes 100 Mal wichtiger ist als z. B. bei ἄνθρωπος oder ἀνήρ'. He considers this 'den schwersten Fehler des Werkes'.

[7] That such words are important and have a bearing on Aquila's manner of translation and exegesis may be seen from his use of the definite article, cp. Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the translation of Aquila.* Cambridge, 1897, p. 12 f. See also below.

the arrangement of compounds and derivatives under the head of the *simplicia*, though the former are also entered in the alphabetical place with cross-references.[8]

3. So far as the 'other' versions and in particular Aquila, the subject of the present effort, is concerned, the material gathered together in the Oxford Concordance is based chiefly on Field's monumental work,[9] but incorporates also later material contained in the printed works of Pitra,[10] Swete,[11] Klostermann,[12] Morin,[13] Burkitt,[14]

---

[8] This plan of arrangement was outlined fully by Margolis, *l. c.* It is justified by the fact that it is in the nature of the Hebrew to ignore the shades of meaning brought out by a preposition attached to the verb in Greek ; e. g. יָשַׁב may be rendered by either οἰκεῖν, ἐνοικεῖν, κατοικεῖν, or παροικεῖν ; and hence it is more practical to have them all grouped together.

[9] 'Monumentum exegit, hisce diebus, Fredericus Fieldius, in summum decus utriusque Academiae Oxoniensis et Cantabrigiensis,' Pitra, *Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi Parata*, Tom. III, p. 551. The full title of Field's work is : *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*. Post Flaminium Nobilium, Drusium, et Montefalconium, adhibita etiam versione Syro-Hexaplari, concinnavit, emendavit, et multis partibus auxit Fridericus Field. Tom. II. Oxonii, 1875.

[10] *Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi Parata*. Tom. III. E Typographeo Veneto, 1883, pp. 551 ff.

[11] *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. 3 vols. Cambridge, 1887-94. Of especial value are the excerpts from Q (Codex Marchalianus).

[12] *Analecta zur Septuaginta, Hexapla und Patristik*. Leipzig, 1895, pp. 47 ff.

[13] *Anecdota Maredsolana seu Monumenta Ecclesiasticae Antiquitatis ex MSS. codicibus nunc primum edita aut denuo illustrata*. Vol. III, Pars I : Sancti Hieronymi Presbyteri Commentarioli in Psalmos. Vol. III, Pars III : Sancti Hieronymi Presbyteri Tractatus novissime reperti. Maredsoli, 1895-1903. Valuable material bearing on the later Greek versions is found in these works of Jerome.

[14] *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the translation of Aquila*. Cambridge, 1897.

Taylor,[15] and, in one instance, unpublished fragments discovered by Dr. Mercati of the Vatican Library; who 'very kindly lent the Editor . . . a transcript of the fragments'.[16]

4. It is to be regretted that the excerpting of Field has been done with little attention to the Hebrew,[17] and betrays occasionally a mechanical haste which has resulted in the incorporation of words which never formed part of the text in question.[18]   But another disappointing feature

[15] *Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests from the Taylor-Schechter collection, including a Fragment of the Twenty-second Psalm according to Origen's Hexapla.* Cambridge, 1900.

[16] See on this find Klostermann, *ZAW.,* XVI (1896), 336 f.   It is to be regretted that the important publication is still due.

[17] Thus under the article κόρος (*satietas*) the references Exod. 8. 14 (10) *bis* ; 3 Kings 5. 11 (25) are to be taken out and transferred to the preceding article κόρος (*corus*).   The Hebrew equivalents are חֹמֶר in Exodus and כֹּר in Kings.   Another grave error of a similar character is found in the article εὑρίσκειν, where Ps. 77 (78), 26 is entered for Symmachus.   Field has correctly εὗρον, which the excerpter misread as εὖρον ; the Hebrew is קָדִים. Hence insert on p. 579 at the head of column 3

<div align="center">

εὖρος

[Sm., Ps. 77 (78). 26].

</div>

An e ample of carelessness appears to be the reference Ezek. 32. 6 for α′ σ′ θ′ under the article προχώρημα.—Under the article κέρδος delete the α′ reference (Ezek. 27. 24).   Field has correctly κέδρος which is duly entered in the Concordance *s.v.*—The α′ reference *s.v.* ἀδρύνειν should be placed under the article preceding (ἀδρός) ; at the same time write σ′ for α′.—The α′ reference *s. v.* ἠχεῖν Ps. 67 (68). 18 should be transferred to σ′.   Delete the α′ reference 3 Kings 3. 3 *s.v.* θύειν.—The article κίτρις should be credited to Al. instead of α′.   In the article κοσκίνωμα add : α′ σ′ θ′ Exod. 27. 4.   This is a plain omission, the accompanying adjective δικτυωτός being duly entered *s. v.*

[18] *Sub* ἐκδιδόναι the Concordance has : α′ θ′ Jer. 37 (44). 12 (which reference is repeated under σ′).   Field gives (*Auctarium*, p. 47 f.) from codd. 86. 88 a rendering of ver. 11 f., attributed to Joannes (see Field's *Prolegomena,* pp. xciii f.), which he follows up by the scholion (from cod. 88) Καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ὁμοίως ἐξέδωκαν.   The excerpter took this to mean :

consists in the fact that the excerpter appears to have considered his task done when he paid attention to Field's text, disregarding on the whole Field's illuminating notes below, which in many instances serve to modify the text above in essential points.[19]

And the remaining [translators] likewise [have] ἐξέδωκαν. Of course, the correct English is : And the remaining [translators] have rendered in a like manner. The reference is to לחלק, for which Joannes has εἰς τὸ νείμασθαι τὸν κλῆρον (to obtain possession of the lot), and so similarly α' θ' τοῦ μερισθῆναι σ' μερίσασθαι (on the exegesis of the Hebrew as well as on the variant reading underlying the Septuagintal rendering ἀγοράσαι, see Margolis, *JAOS.*, XXX (1910), 308 f.). On p. 1503, col. 2, ἐκζεῖν α' σ', Ezek. 24. 13 (from Swete) is to be struck out. Swete adduces from Q : * θ' εν τη ακαθαρσια σου ζεμμα (ζεμα with one μ, Qᵃ) and from Qᵐᵍ ad ζεμ(μ)α : α' σ' συνταγη ζεμα εξεζεσε. The excerpter took the whole phrase as coming from α' σ', whereas it is clear that only συνταγη belongs to the two ; what follows is a gloss on ζεμα (θ''s rendering) which is erroneously combined with Greek (ἐκ)ζεῖν 'boil over'.—*Sub* ἔσω strike out the references α' σ' θ' 1 Kings 26. 19, and θ' 1 Kings 25. 1. In the latter place Field has (from the margin of 243) o' ραμα θ' το εσω 'h. e. *quod intus* (in textu) *habetur*' (so Field explicitly below the text). The purport of the marginal note is to say that Origen wrote in the Septuagint column ραμα = רָמָה, whereas θ' had the same as in the text, i. e. 'Ἀρμαθαίμ. In the other passage λ' τὸ ἔσω means that they read as in the text ἐν κληρονομίᾳ. Accordingly two additional entries are obtained for α' σ' θ' under ἐν and κληρονομία. A clear example of superficial haste is the ignoring of a period (.). Job 2. 9, Field prints : α' θ' καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή. ÷χρόνου δὲ πολλοῦ προβεβηκότος ✕. Οὐ κεῖται ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ. The whole means that in the place of the Septuagintal χρόνου δὲ πολλοῦ προβεβηκότος (a free expansion) which, as is expressly noted, is not found in the Hebrew, α' θ' had merely the conjunction καί. The excerpter's eye overlooked Field's period after γυνή and thus included χρόνου (see *s. v.*) in the phrase ascribed to α' θ' ; curiously enough there is no reference to Job 2. 9, α' θ' *s. vv.* πολύς and προβαίνειν !

---

[19] A case in point has been met at the end of the previous note, where surely a glance at Field's notes would have made impossible the error of citing *sub* ἔσω the meaningless references there given. Had the notes been consulted, a further faulty reference should have been added : α' θ' 1 Kings 25. 31 (see foot-note 45). But here Field wisely kept out of his text the phraseology of the gloss and merely registered the result. Obviously it was the excerpter's duty in every case to square the text with the notes, which,

5. Much valuable instruction as Field's notes offer, the scope of the present work would have been incomplete

however, he failed to do. The examples are so numerous that only a selection can be pointed out here.   Thus *sub* ἀναθεματίζειν, Deut. 3. 3 and 6, are attributed to α'.   Now Field (foot-note 1) correctly records the tradition according to which α' had ἀνεθεματίσαμεν for Ⓖ ἐπατάξαμεν = (וַ)בַּכֵּ(הוּ) and just as rightly remarks ʻinvitis Regiis tribus . . . , qui lectionem ad ver. 6 recte retrahunt'; on the basis of the latter authority he prints in ver. 6 α' ἀνεθεματίσαμεν for Ⓖ ἐξωλοθρεύσαμεν = וַנַּחֲרֵם.   The Editors of the Concordance were free either to adopt Field's suggestion and therefore to quote 3. 6 or to follow tradition implicitly and hence to record 3. 3.   Only by disregarding the notes was it possible for them to register both 3. 3 and 3. 6.   In my own Index 3. 3 is of course deleted.   Similarly the reference 4 Kings 2. 14 (for α' σ' θ') *sub* κρύφιος should be eliminated : Theodoret ascribes the rendering to ʻthe other ἑρμηνευταί', but Field (note 22) expressly adds ʻubi ἑρμηνευταί de *enarratoribus*, non de *interpretibus* intelligendum videtur'.   We are dealing here merely with a fanciful etymology which combined αφφω with Hebrew חבא and is no worse than αφφω πατέρες (combined with אב) in the Onomastica Vaticana ; see Lagarde, *Onomastica Sacra*[2], 187. 43.   As a matter of fact, α' wrote καίπερ αὐτός and σ' καὶ νῦν (see Field).   Strike out also the first reference *sub* φύλαξις (α', Isa. 26. 3).   See Field, under note 8 ; the emendation φυλάξεις (of which φυλαξις is an itacistic error) εἰρήνην is self-evident.   See further my Greek Index, *s.v.* εἰς, εἶς, ἐν, ἐπικαλύπτειν, εὑρίσκειν, ζωοῦν, ἰά, καλεῖν, σύντονος, τοῖχος.   Many words and references have been incorporated by the Editors where Field has indicated his doubt by printing the phrases in question in brackets.   In my Index they are omitted.   Such are, for instance, Job 27. 20 ἐν περιστάσει μὴ ἐκφύγοι; Prov. 31. 3 τὰ σὰ χρήματα ; Isa. 3. 8 κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου γέγονεν ; *ibid.*, 40. 24 ἄνεμος ; Jer. 20. 9 φέρειν ; *ibid.* 31 (38). 22, ἐν τῇ σωτηρίᾳ ; *ibid.* 44 (51). 29 εἰς κακά ; Amos 1. 2, προβάτων.   In nearly all of these cases there is no Hebrew to correspond in the MT.   Field's notes, if they had been at all consulted, would have led to the transfer of several references from α' to σ', θ', or Al.   The Editors' point of view may have been to follow the traditional signature and to refrain from criticism however justified.   In my own Index I have thought it advisable, with due reference to what Field has to say in the notes, to indicate a reasonable doubt in tradition by printing all such words or references in brackets.   See *s.v.* ἀνευλαβής; ἀπόθετος Ps. 30 (31). 20 ; ἀποθνήσκειν Job 14. 14 ; ἄφοβος ; διαμένειν ; δυσωπεῖσθαι ; μέγας 2 Kings 5. 10 ; πάλιν ; παρά Jer. 52. 8 ; πρόσωπον Job 20. 25.   I have similarly included in brackets words and references which tradition ascribes to α' and where the signature has been rightly enclosed by Field in brackets ; in his notes are found the

had not an attempt been made to transcend Field in the
application of critical canons to the mass of fragments
which tradition ascribes to Aquila.   At the time when
Field published his work (1875) no continuous text of
Aquila's Greek version had come to light.   Foremost
among the new finds exhibiting a continuous Aquila text
stand Taylor's Cairo and Mercati's Milan Palimpsests of
the remains of the Hexapla Psalter.   In both Aquila
occupies the (third) column immediately after the (second)
column containing the Greek transliteration of the Hebrew.
This is in conformity with the testimony of Eusebius,
Jerome, and Epiphanius concerning the order of the
Hexaplaric columns.[20]   On comparing the text [21] with
the data in Field we find that though on the whole there
is agreement there are nevertheless more or less important
divergencies ; and above all we are taught to distrust the
signatures which Field faithfully copied from his sources.[22]

reasons upon which he bases his doubts.   For examples, see my Index, s. v.
εὐθύτης Jer. 13. 10; ἐν 1 Kings 14. 18; θεός ibid.; καρδία Jer. 13. 10;
μετά Gen. 16, 6; παρεμβολή 1 Kings 14. 18; πονηρός Jer. 13. 10; ὑπανα-
χωρεῖν; φυγή.

[20] See Swete, Introduction to the OT. in Greek, 1900, 64.

[21] Ps. 21 (22). 20-27, Taylor; 45 (46). 1-4, Mercati apud Klostermann,
ZAW., XVI (1896), 336 f. (Swete, l. c., 62 f.).

[22] Here is a collation in detail (including also the data for σ' θ') : Ps. 21.
15 σ' (καὶ) διέστη F(ield) = και διεστη T(aylor): 17 σ' ὅτι ἐκύκλωσάν με θηραταί
F contrast περιεκυκλω (sic) γαρ με κυνες T ; 21 α' μοναχήν (μου) σ' τὴν
μονότητά μου (in part based on Syrohex.) F = α' μοναχην μου σ' την μονοτητα
μου T ; Ps. 45. 1 α' τῷ νικοποιῷ τῶν υἱῶν Κορὲ ἐπὶ νεανιοτήτων μελῴδημα F =
M(ercati) with the exception of the last word which is ασμα in M (see my
Index, s. v. μελῴδημα: it is used for עֲלָמוֹת only in this place, while in the other
twenty instances it invariably renders מִזְמוֹר; while ᾆσμα = שִׁיר in all cases
but one) ; on the other hand σ' 's rendering in F tallies in every particular
with that in M ; 2 α' σ' εὑρέθη σφόδρα. Ἄλλος· ἐν θλίψεσιν εὑρισκόμενος
(Field's sources are Syrohex. ܐܫܬܟܚ ܣܓܝ .ܣ .ܐ—Field adds that
the Syrian must have followed a faulty reading εὑρέθης σφόδρα—and Chrysost.:

Next in order come the Palimpsests from the Taylor-Schechter Genizah Collection edited by Burkitt and Taylor, which show us manuscripts of Aquila as they were current among Greek-speaking Jews in a form which in its origin is older than the Hexapla. The portions extant cover 3 Kings 21 (20). 9–17 ; 4 Kings 23. 12–27 ; Ps. 89 (90). 17 ; 90 (91) ; 91 (92). 1–10 ; 95 (96). 7–13 ; 96 (97) ; 97 (98). 3 ; 101 (102). 16–29 ; 102 (103). 1–13 ; and the text is continuous (barring lacunae owing to the imperfect condition of the manuscript). In designating the version as Aquila's no external evidence such as the Hexapla Fragments revealed was available, and the editors were thrown back upon the scanty citations in Field, but in the main upon the internal character of the version which comports with the general statements concerning it in patristic literature.[23]

Αλλος· ἐν θλ. εὑρισκόμενος ; Nobil. : Οἱ λοιποί· εὑρέθη εὑρισκόμενος, which Field rightly divides into εὑρέθη and εὑρισκόμενος) F comp. α' εν θλιψεσιν ευρεθης (the actual faulty reading presupposed by Syrohex.) σφοδρα σ' εν θλιψεσιν ευρισκομενος σφοδρα M (while σ' rightly took נִמְצָא to be a participle, α' rendered it as a perfect) ; 3 α' σφάλλεσθαι σ' κλίνεσθαι F = M ; 4 α' ὑπερηφανίᾳ F = M ; the long quotation from σ' in F agrees with M except that αὐτῶν is omitted in M (see Field's note). It is interesting in this connexion to study the bearing of the new texts on the Syrohex. material which Field has done into Greek. 21. 17 σ' ἐκύκλωσαν F contrast περιηλθον T (the Syriac has ܘܐܬܟܪܟ̣ both for α' and σ' ; but ܐܬܟ̣ corresponds to κυκλοῦν, comp. for instance Joshua 6. 3, 4, 15, and also to περιέρχεσθαι, comp. Joshua 6. 7, 11, 15) ; σ' ὡς ζητοῦντες δῆσαι χεῖράς μου καὶ πόδας μου F contrast ως λεωντας χειρας μου και τους ποδας μου T ; 18 σ' only ἐμοῦ is to be corrected into μου and καί excised ; 20 α' σ' σπεῦσον F = T ; 22 α' εἰσήκουσάς με F contrast εισ]ακουσον μου T, σ' τὴν κάκωσίν μου F = T ; 25 α' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ F contrast εξ αυτου T ; 26 α' πολλῇ F = T ; 27 πραεῖς sine nomine (strike out the article) F = α' T ; 45. 3 α' σ' ἐν τῷ ἀλλάσσεσθαι τὴν γῆν F contrast α' εν τωι ανταλλασσεσθαι γην (note the compound and the omission of the article) σ' εν ταις (r. τωι) συγχεισθαι γην M ; ibid., in α' strike out the article ⟨ὄρη⟩ ; 4 according to M α' has αε[ι for סֶלָה.

[23] See the references below (Chapter I).

Now in comparing these texts with Field we find again notable agreement, but also differences and untrustworthy signatures.[24]   It is therefore clear that where Field is our sole authority for an Aquila rendering the whole force of internal evidence must come into play if we are minded to give to Aquila what is his and not perchance the property of another.   Field's sources, whether we consider the stores collected by his predecessors[25] or his own notable additions, are ultimately patristic citations or excerpts from the Hexaplaric columns found between the lines or on the margin of codices of the Septuagint, or again asterisked elements of the fifth Hexaplar column to which a signature is attached.   Aside from the fact that Field will bear

[24] Thus, to mention only important deviations, Ps. 90. 6 $\dot{\rho}\dot{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\sigma$ (which would presuppose דְּבַר for דֶּבֶר) F contrast λοιμου T (which reading Field postulates in note 12 on the basis of Syrohex.) ; 11 T has σε after εντελειται (r. σοι = לְךָ) ; 91. 4 εβλη F contrast ναβλη T ; 7 the first και in F is rightly missing in T (comp. Hebr.).   T frequently omits the article where F has it (so Ps. 90. 1, 2, 7, 12 ; 95. 7 bis, 11, 12 bis) ; the matter has some importance in dealing with α''s manner of translation.

Thus F's doubt as to the correctness of the signature 90. 4 end is substantiated by T : in the place of ὡς πανοπλία α' has simply ασπις ; ibid., 7 the double signature α' σ' is to be taken a parte potiori; according to T α' has not εκ but απο; as for the article see preceding note.

[25] The first to collect Hexaplaric fragments was Petrus Morinus who incorporated them in annotations to the so-called editio Sixtina or Romana of the Greek Bible, published in 1587 at Rome.   After him Joannes Drusius published the same material under the title: Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in totum V. T. Fragmenta, collecta, versa et notis illustrata a Johanne Drusio, Arnhem, 1622.   Drusius's work was followed by Lambertus Bos, Vetus Testamentum ex versione LXX interpretum secundum exemplar Vaticanum Romae editum, una cum Scholiis ejusdem editionis, variis MSS, codicum veterumque exemplarium lectionibus, necnon Fragmentis versionum Aquilae, Symmachi et Theodotionis, Franequerae, 1709.   A more complete edition was that of D. Bernardus de Montfaucon, the immediate predecessor of Field.   His work is entitled : Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, multis partibus auctiora quam a Flaminio Nobilio et Joanne Drusio edita fuerint. Tom. II.   Parisiis, 1713.

correction from an ocular inspection of the codices he
quotes on the authority of his predecessors or the ' schedae
Holmesianae '—the margin of the Larger Cambridge
Septuagint, as well as the works of Pitra and Swete,
yield important material—caution is requisite even where
there is no ground to suspect that the manuscripts have
in any way been departed from.   In the first place the
signatures may be wrong,[26] or the notes may have been

[26] There is particular cause for doubt where a rendering is ascribed to
α' in common with other translators.   Comp. Ps. 48 (49). 18 α' θ' ε' σ' ἀκολου-
θοῦσα ; this is true enough so far as σ' goes, comp. the phrase in full
preserved in another source οὐδὲ συγκαταβήσεται ἀκολουθοῦσα αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα
αὐτοῦ, whereas according to the same source α' wrote οὐδὲ συγκαταβήσεται
ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ δόξα αὐτοῦ.   Now ἀκολουθεῖν is never elsewhere used by α',
while σ' apparently is very fond of the verb (see *Concordance, s.v.*).   Very
likely the ascription to α' rests on an error.—Isa. 22. 14 אָמַר אֲדֹנָי יֶהוִֹה
צְבָאוֹת α' θ' εἶπεν κύριος κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων.   Montfaucon referred it rightly
to σ' θ', stating as his reason that α' always puts στρατιῶν for צְבָאוֹת.   See
furthermore below.—Examples with α' included in the generic signature οἱ
λοιποί : 1 Kings 20. 19 וְיִשְׁבְּצָתְךָ οἱ λ· καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ, but we have for α' with
specific ascription καὶ τρισσεύσας ; 4 Kings 15. 5 בְּבֵית הַחָפְשִׁית οἱ λ·
κρυφαίως (Theodoret), but contrast α' ἐν οἴκῳ τῆς ἐλευθερίας (cod. 243 sup-
ported by the Syrohex.) ; Job 21. 23 עֲצָמוֹ תְּמוֹ οἱ λ· ἰσχύων ἄμωμος but
contrast α' ἐν ὀστεώσει ἁπλότητος αὐτοῦ so characteristically in conformity
with α''s diction ; Ps. 36 (37). 37 f. οἱ λ· τὰ μέλλοντα (ver. 37) τὰ ἔσχατα
(ver. 38) (Procop. ; this is the meaning of his remark though it is a trifle
confused) which is true enough for σ' who writes μέλλοντα in ver. 37 and
τὰ ἔσχατα in ver. 38, while α' is expressly credited with ἔσχατον (note the
sing.) in both verses; Ezek. 1. 24 שַׁדַּי λ· θεοῦ σαδδαί but contrast α' ἱκανοῦ
(α' nowhere else transliterates שַׁדַּי) ; 12. 10 הַנָּשִׂיא הַמַּשָּׂא הַזֶּה θ' καὶ λ·
ὁ ἄρχων ὁ ἀφηγούμενος οὗτος but contrast α' τὸ ἐπηρμένον τὸ ἄρμα τοῦτο and
σ' περὶ τοῦ ἄρχοντος τὸ λῆμμα τοῦτο ; Hos. 10. 15 בַּשַּׁחַר οἱ λ· ὡς ὄρθρος but
contrast α' ἐν ὄρθρῳ.   While in all these cases the conflicting testimony may
be explained as going back to the two editions of Aquila (see below), it is
just as likely, and in many instances much more probable, that the inclusion
of α' under οἱ λοιποί rests on an error.   Important in this connexion is the
remark of Prof. G. F. Moore (*AJSL.*, XXIX (1912), 39, n. 9) that ' Field,
in the greater part of his Hexapla, follows Montfaucon in the error' of
resolving the construction λ, which is found on the margin of codd. of the

attached to the wrong word.[27]   Then we meet with
doublets, one element in which alone can belong to
Aquila.[28]   Quite another matter are parallel renderings

Septuagint, by λοιποι, whereas in reality Lucian (Λουκιανός) was meant.
Comp., e. g., Num. 3. 22 in BM, where a′ σ′ render פקודיהם by επεσκεμμενοι,
while to λ (as well as o′) is attributed επισκεψις.

[27] Thus Job 38. 7 Field cites a′ θ′ ἅμα υἱοὶ θεοῦ to the words of the text
כָּל־בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים ⑹ πάντες ἄγγελοί μου ; but while ἅμα is found for כל
(ἡ ἐκκλησία ἅμα כל הקהל) 2 Chron. 30. 23 ⑹, it is unlikely that a′ would
indulge in such freedom ; it is more probable that ἅμα in Field's source was
misplaced from the line above and belongs in front of ἄστρα, where indeed
Syrohex. places it (see Field).—Isa. 30. 33, I am inclined to think that
a′ κέδρινα does not belong to מדרתה but to גְּפְרִית, comp. עֲצֵי גֹפֶר Gen. 6. 14
εν τω εβραιω εξ ξυλων κεδρινων i^m (BM) ; but it ought to be stated that a′ has
there ασηπτων τεθε(ι)ωμενων.—Zeph. 1. 12 אַחְפֵּשׂ οἱ λοιποί· καὶ ἐκδικήσω : not
only καί is puzzling here but also ἐκδικεῖν, which is used by a′ σ′ θ′ Ἑβραῖος
and Ἄλλος for נקם only and is not so easy as an equivalent for חפשׂ ; hence
Schleusner may be right with his suggestion that καὶ ἐκδικήσω belongs to the
following וּפָקַדְתִּי [Schleusner is wrong. ⑹ has itself καὶ ἐκδικήσω ; hence
the marginal note would have been purposeless. Moreover, according to
Dr. Reider's own Index, פקד is rendered uniformly in a′ ἐπισκέπτειν. M].

[28] Here is a list which is fairly complete : Exod. 28. 33 BM register for
a′ διαφορου διβαφου for שָׁנִי, but the former alone belongs to a′, who uses it
four more times for שָׁנִי (which he derives from שָׁנָה = be different), while
the second is peculiar to σ′ alone, who employs it also 28. 5 ; 35. 23, 35.—
Judges 18. 7 a′ καὶ οὐκ ἐνῆν καταισχύνων οὐδὲ διατρέπων, Field casts suspicion
on the derivation of the rendering as a whole from a′, pointing to Job 11. 3,
where a′ has ἐντρέπων for מַכְלִים, and to Isa. 29. 22, where the rarer verb
διατρέπεσθαι is used by σ′ (for Hebr. חָוַר, θ′ has ἐν-) ; to which may be added
that καταισχύνων and διατρέπων are apparently parallel renderings for Hebr.
מַכְלִים and that the same doublet, only in an inverted order, occurs in the
B text of the Septuagint (which also has a doublet for עָצַר : ἐκπιέζων
θησαυροῦ ; the second element would appear to have been introduced from
Origen, see Field) ; there is no reason therefore to discard the entire
rendering as not belonging to a′ ; it is true, ἐνῆν does not sound as an
a′ rendering ; but of the two verbs used for מַכְלִים καταισχύνων might
credibly be assigned to a′, and it should be excised in the B text as a foreign
element.—2 Kings 3. 22 מֵהִתְגָּרוּד a′ ⟨ἀπὸ⟩ τοῦ γεδδοὺρ μονοζώνου, Field calls
the whole rendering in question in view of the express citation a′ ἀπὸ τοῦ
εὐζώνου in cod. 243 and parallel passages where a′ consistently writes
εὔζωνος for גְּדוּד ; still the case may be disposed of in this way : in the

ascribed to Aquila which go back to the two editions of
his work; the subject is adequately dealt with by Field in
his Prolegomena.[29]

Naturally enough the text of Aquila is here and there
handed down in a faulty condition. No mention shall be
made here of errors set right by Field; but a few which
have escaped his attention are given below.[30] Lastly, an

doublet μονοζώνου represents a textual variant of ευζωνου, while the trans-
literation cannot possibly come from a', γεδδούρ for גְּדוּד being found in the
Septuagint of Kings and Chronicles (see 1 Kings 30. 8, 15, 15, 23; 1 Chron.
12. 21 (22); [2 Chron. 22. 1,93^{mg}; comp. also 1 Ch. 12. 7 (8) γεδ(δ)ωρ. M]).—
Jer. 20. 2 οἱ γ' καὶ ἐνέβαλεν καὶ ἔδωκεν : this note should be corrected in
accordance with Q^{mg} καὶ ἐνέβαλεν οἱ γ' καὶ ἔδωκεν, Hebr. וַיִּתֵּן.—Add from
Pitra, Exod. 8. 7 (3) בְּלֶמְתֶּהָ a' ἐν ἠρεμαίοις ἀποκρύφοις, where the second
element does not belong to a', see Field ad loc. and comp. 7. 11, 22 ; also
Ps. 20 (21). 12 a' ἐλογίσαντο ἐννοίας βουλὴν ἣν οὐ μὴ δύνωνται ἀδυνάτους ;
σ' διελογίσαντο βουλὰς ἃς οὐ μὴ δύνωνται ; θ' ἐλογίσαντο ἀπ' ἔννοιαν οὐ μὴ δύν. :
there is much confusion here, one is tempted to vindicate for a' what is
ascribed to θ' (comp. ἀπ' = מ of מְזִמָּה taken as a preposition, but it exercises
no influence on the construction, the noun being placed in the accusative ;
furthermore, absence of the relative exactly as in Hebrew); in the rendering
attributed to a' ἀδυνάτους and ἐννοίας belong to σ' (see Field).

[29] pp. xxiv ff.

[30] Thus Job 21. 17 אֵיד a' ἐπικλυσμός is probably to be emended to
ἐπιβλυσμός : the former is found only once in the Greek Bible (σ' for Hebrew
שֶׁטֶף Dan. 9. 26), while the latter is exclusively an a' word and is used
uniformly for אֵ(י)ד ; the interchange of κ and β is a usual occurrence in
cursive script.—Ps. 34 (35). 28 תְּהִלָּתֶךָ a' ὑμνήσει σε read perhaps υμνησι
σου = ὕμνησίν σου ; certainly it is unlikely that a' read תְּהִלָּלֶךָ.—82 (83), 3
ὤκλασαν is probably miswritten for ὤχλασαν ; see Index, s. v. ὀχλάζειν.—
Isa. 7. 20 בְּמֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר a' ἐν βασιλείᾳ Ἀσσυρίων read ἐν βασιλεῖ Ἀσσυρίων
(a dittographed).—Jer. 5. 31 יָרְדּוּ a' ἐπεκρότουν has been emended by
Cappellus and L. Bos (apud Schleusner) to ἐπεκράτουν ; the same error
underlies ἐπεκρότησαν in the Septuagint, comp. also 3 Kings 9. 23 A.—6. 25
לְאוֹיֵב a' τῶν ἐθνῶν read τῶν ἐχθρῶν.—Ezek. 19. 7 אַלְמְנוֹתָיו a' χώρας read
χήρας.—26. 4 חוֹמוֹת צֹר a' σ' θ (τὰ τείχη) σου read σόρ, comp. 𝕲.—Hos. 12.
8 (9) לִי אוֹן a' ἀνωφελὲς αὐτῷ read ἐμαυτῷ like 𝕲.—From Pitra : Gen. 14. 23
a' ἱμάτιον read ἱμάντος, so j^m s^m according to BM (see also Field, n. 23),
Hebr. שְׂרוֹךְ ; 15. 12 תַּרְדֵּמָה a' κάρσος σ' κάρος, comp. a' κορος (κορσος C₂)

important point, to which as far as I know scant attention
has been paid, deserves on that very account to be empha-
sized.   It follows from the nature of the majority of notes,
be they patristic or marginal, that the aim is to contrast
a rendering of the later Greek versions with that in the
Septuagint.   Where the rendering consists of a whole
phrase the tendency was to be accurate in the point of
difference which was essential for the moment, and to be
less exact with non-essentials which were therefore accom-
modated to the diction of the Septuagint.   In other words,
renderings ascribed to the Three are frequently to be under-
stood *a parte potiori.*   To illustrate by an example: Joshua
1. 1 אֶל־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בִּן־נוּן, ⅏ τῷ Ἰησοῖ υἱῷ Ναυή. α′ σ′ πρὸς Ἰησοῦν
υἱὸν Ναυή; the salient point is that whereas ⅏ construed
εἶπεν with the dative, both α′ and σ′ wrote πρός c. acc. for
Hebr. אֶל; that much may be relied upon; but it would be
hazardous to follow the source for the other parts of the
phrase; α′ at least cannot be credited with the graecized
Ἰησοῦν, for well-understood reasons; Deut. 1. 38 we know
from the margin of M that α′ wrote Ιωσονα (so BM; Field
has Ιησονα); accordingly α′ must have written here προς
Ιωσονα, and we may even go farther and complete the
phrase to read υιον Νουν (we find Exod. 33. 11 ννν in F^b
and Deut. 1. 38 νουη in F^b M^m, read in both places Νουν,
comp. ⅏ 1 Chron. 7. 27 where Νουμ BA should of course
be corrected into Νουν, so Lagarde's text).   Instructive
is also the following example: Job 5. 5 וְאֶל־מִצְנִּים יִקָּחֵהוּ,
⅏ αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐκ κακῶν οὐκ ἐξαίρετοι ἔσονται, α′ αὐτὸς δὲ πρὸς

σ′ καπος j^m s^m v^m c₃^m in BM who also quote α′ σ′ *nausea* from Barh. ; Field
prints in the text α′ κόπος σ′ κάπος, he adds in a note that though the α′
reading which he prints is best attested it is nevertheless unsatisfactory ; it
would seem to me that both α′ and σ′ wrote κάπος, which alone corresponds
to the Hebrew.

ἐνόπλων ἀρθήσεται, σ΄ αὐτοὶ δὲ πρὸς ἐνόπλων ἀρθήσονται. It is evident at a glance that personal pronoun + δέ, common to all these versions, really belongs to ᴪ (and σ΄): apart from the fact that α΄ could not have used it because it has no equivalent in MT, the phrase itself is foreign to α΄'s diction while being peculiar to the Septuagint; note the use of δέ, whereas α΄ would employ καί. This being of less moment they were not exact in quoting it, while quoting carefully the point of difference: πρὸς ἐνόπλων ἀρθήσεται.

6. It is obvious that my own Index, constructed as it is with due regard to the critical points just enumerated, will in turn furnish a means by which many questions of detail will solve themselves. For naturally the double Index, Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek, resolves itself into a complete storehouse of observations concerning the various sides of Aquila as a translator and student of the Scriptures. By way of summing up the material which is necessarily scattered in the Index itself, I propose to present in the following chapters a study of

    I. Aquila's Manner of Translation;
    II. Aquila's Knowledge of the Hebrew Grammar and Lexicon;
    III. Aquila's Exegesis;
    IV. The Hebrew Text underlying Aquila's Version.

In the concluding pages a number of unsolved problems will be laid before the reader.

CHAPTER I

AQUILA'S MANNER OF TRANSLATION

7. THE character of Aquila's Greek style which is bound up with his mannerism as a translator is customarily summed up in the one epithet: extremely literal. Already from antiquity we have comments which run to the effect that Aquila was 'a slave to the letter' (δουλεύων τῇ Ἑβραϊκῇ λέξει),[31] who strove to render 'not merely words, but even syllables and letters (*qui non solum verba, sed etymologias quoque verborum transferre conatus est . . . et syllabas interpretatur et literas*)'.[32] The standard examples by which these comments were accompanied refer in the first place to the rendering of the *nota accusativi* את by σύν, as, for instance, Gen. I. I ἐν κεφαλαίῳ ἔκτισεν θεὸς σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τὴν γῆν,[33] and in the second place to

---

[31] Origen, *Epist. ad Afric.* 3.

[32] Jerome, *Epist. LVII ad Pammachium*, 11.

[33] *Ibid.*, supplemented by Field from Philoponus ; comp. now BM (from U₂). See Index, *s. v.* σύν. This particle is used whenever את is followed by the Hebrew article or by כל, otherwise the Greek article takes the place of σύν. Furthermore, σύν when employed for the *nota accusativi* את, has no influence on the construction. Comp. on all this Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings*, &c., p. 12. This rule, it must be remembered, is based only on the later finds ; in Field's *Hexapla*, owing probably to the fault of the copyists, σύν is very often missing where we have reason to expect it. There can be no question but that a' in his anxiety to express in Greek the Hebrew particle followed the hermeneutics of the day, according to which את no less than אף and גם served to indicate inclusion (רבוי ; see XXXII Middot of R. Jose the Galilean, § 1, ed. Katzenellenbogen, pp. 9 ff. ; Berakot 14 b, l. 9 from below ; b. Pesaḥim 22 b ; Ḥagigah 12 a ; Gen. r. 1. 14 (ed. Theodor, p. 12) ; Mielziner, *Introduction to the Talmud*, pp. 124 f., 182 ff. ; Strack, *Einleitung in den Talmud*[4], 124 ; Friedmann, *Onkelos und Akylas*, p. 33,

such odd words or new coinages as χεῦμα, ὀπωρισμός, στιλπνότης for דָּגָן, תִּירֹשׁ, יִצְהָר.[34] Another instance of 'unseemly' slavishness and 'cacophony' which is singled out is the repetition after the manner of Hebrew of an

n. 2). So in this very passage, e.g., the Rabbis say that אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם is inclusive of sun, moon, and stars, and אֵת הָאָרֶץ of trees, herbs, and the Garden of Eden. It is immaterial for our purposes whether the Middah in question was evolved by Akiba or his predecessors, nor does it matter whether Aquila was a pupil of R. Akiba (or, according to another account, of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua) or merely a contemporary of these scholars, as Friedmann, *l. c.*, contends ; it is sufficient to know that α′'s literalism was in deference to the hermeneutics of the day.

Although the Concordance registers συν c. acc. also for σ′ and θ′, a doubt may be expressed as to whether these two translators could be guilty of so pronounced a literalism which according to the uniform testimony of antiquity characterizes α′ alone. Where, as in Jer. 28 (35). 10 and 32 (39). 9, the signature is generic (γ′ or παντες), it is safe to say that συν belongs to α′ alone ; instructive is the second passage where Qᵐᵍ (see Swete) ignores the particle. Elsewhere the particle is found in front of πας and we should probably read συμπας (comp. e.g. Jer. 35 (42). 18 Field as against Swete). There still remain examples where the signature is specific and πας does not follow (comp. Isa. 49. 21 α′ θ′ ; Jer. 32 (39). 14 θ′, both Swete). It will hardly do on the basis of evidence so scanty to acquiesce in ascribing συν c. acc. to σ′ or θ′.

As for the references adduced in the Concordance for the Septuagint, the examples outside Ecclesiastes are all found in additions peculiar to certain MSS. (A and others) and going back to the Hexapla. In one instance, the long passage 3 Kings 14. 1–20, we have the express testimony of a scholion in Syrohex. according to which the whole passage came from α′. It will be shown below that that can be understood only *a parte potiori*. As for Ecclesiastes, the safest way to account for συν and similar mannerisms reminiscent of α′ is to say that we are dealing with a translator who though not α′ himself belonged to the same school as α′ (see on this question Graetz, *Kohélet*, 174 ff.; Renan, *L'Ecclésiaste*, 54 ff.; Klostermann, *De libri Coheleth versione Alexandrina*, 41 ff.).

[34] Comp. Jerome. *l. c.*: 'Quis enim pro *frumento* et *vino* et *oleo*, possit vel legere, vel intelligere, χεῦμα, ὀπωρισμόν, στιλπνότητα, quod nos possumus dicere *fusionem, pomationemque*, et *splendentiam?*—As for דָּגָן, compare Arab. جَدَّس (rain, pour) which Saadya employs for that word, comp. Merx's *Archiv*, I, 51, n. 2.

object numbered after each element of a compound number, as Gen. 5. 5 ἐννακόσια ἔτος καὶ τριάκοντα ἔτος for תְּשַׁע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה וּשְׁלֹשִׁים שָׁנָה.[35]

8. It is not always, however, in a tone of scorn that Aquila's literalness is spoken of. Both Origen and Jerome, whose words of condemnation have been alluded to, at other times indulge in words of praise. Thus the Greek Father speaks of Aquila as ' having striven emulously to bring out the proper meaning of words' (ὁ κυριώτατα ἑρμηνεύειν φιλοτιμούμενος ᾿Ακύλας),[36] and the Latin designates him an 'industrious and painstaking translator, very learned in the Greek language' (diligens et curiosus interpres . . . eruditissimus linguae Graecae).[37]   And this twofold verdict has been repeated ever since down to our own day.   Thus Voss refers to Aquila's version as ' obscure and unseemly in the extreme, devoid of sense' (obscurissima et distortissima et nullam sensus rationem habuisse videretur).[38]   Burkitt says of the Fragment published by him : ' It is written in Greek more uncouth than has ever before issued from the Cambridge University Press' ;[39]   and Thackeray speaks of Aquila's ' barbarous version '.[40]   On the other hand there are not lacking, according to Field, evidences of elegance and, so far as the vocabulary is concerned, traces of the influence of Homer and Herodotus.[41]

9. There is no gainsaying the pedantic literalness of Aquila's version imparting to it, as it does on the whole,

---

[35] Epiphanius, De Mens. et Pond., ed. Lagarde (Symmicta, I), 154.

[36] Quoted by Field, p. xxi.

[37] See Comm. on Hosea, 2. 16-17 (Vallarsi, VI, 25); on Isa. 49. 5-6 (Vallarsi, IV, 564). See also Epist. 32 ad Marcellam (Vallarsi, I, 152) and Comm. on Hab. 3. 11-13 (Vallarsi, VI, 656).

[38] Quoted by Hody, De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, p. 578.

[39] JQR., X (1898), 208.   [40] l.c., 9.   [41] p. xxiii f.

the character of an interlinear. The extreme fidelity to
the Hebrew and the offences against the genius of the
Greek language show themselves in a variety of ways.
To begin with, Aquila adheres closely to the Hebrew
form of proper names and that in the pronunciation of
his day. We can understand well enough why Joshua
becomes with him Ιωσουα instead of Ιησους;[42] but he also
writes and treats as indeclinables Ελκιαου (⑤ Χελχιας,
r. Χελκιας), Ιωσιαου nom. and gen. (⑤ Ιωσ(ε)ιας, Ιωσ(ε)ια),
Μενασσε (⑤ Μανασσης), Μωση gen. (⑤ Μωυση or Μωυσεως),
Σο]λωμω (⑤ Σάλωμων)—τοις Ασθαρωθ (⑤ τη Ασταρτη)—Βηθηλ
(⑤ Βαιθηλ), Τ(ε)ιων,[43] Ps. 101 (102). 17, 22 (⑤ Σ(ε)ιων)—
φεσα 4 Kings 23 (comp. also φεσε, Deut. 16. 1 and φασε⟨χ⟩
Joshua 5. 10 ; ⑤ πασχα). Even the *nomen gentilicium*, though
Hellenized usually, is sometimes found in an altogether
Hebrew garb; comp. Gen. 14. 3 אֱמֹרִי = Ἀμωρί; גִּרְשַׁנִּי =
Γηρσουννει, Num. 3. 23 ; שִׁמְרֹנִי = Σαμραμεί, Num. 26. 20 (24) ;
מַעֲכָתִי = Μαχαθί, Deut. 3. 14 [but in this particular a′ does
not stand out by himself. M]. The impression pro-
duced upon a Greek ear may be likened to the aversion
with which in a modern Jewish translation some such
transliterations as Joshiyyahu, Moshe, Shelomoh, Tsiyyon,
Pesa(c)h would be received.[44] It should be borne in mind,

---

[42] See above, § 5.

[43] The τι apparently is meant to bring out the specific pronunciation of צ.
Another example is εν ετιειμ for בַּצַּיִם Ezek. 30. 9: εν ετιειμ = β (= εν)
+ετιειμ. Comp. with both τιαδη B* for the letter צדי Lam. 1–4.

[44] As for the manner in which the Septuagint deals with proper names,
see Thackeray, § 11. The extreme of Hellenization is found in 1 Esdras
and Josephus: Thackeray, § 11. 2. As for φασεχ, it is found outside a′ in σ′
(Exod. 12. 11, 27 ; Num. 9. 2 ; Joshua 5. 10) and in ⑤ only in 2 Chron. 30 and
35 (see Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, 67) and Jer. 38 (31). 8, where the translator
misread במועד פסח בם עור ופסח as ἐν ἑορτῇ φασεκ. a′ probably wrote
φεσα or φεσε but hardly φασεχ ; see Chapter II.

however, that in the matter of transliterating words which are not proper names it is not Aquila but Theodotion that has the largest number.[45] Aquila shows a predilection for translating many a place-name and incidentally also certain names of persons.[46] While, in the case of other translators, notably the Septuagint, the motive was to give the Greek Scriptures as far as possible a Hellenized form,[47] it was with Aquila merely a matter of accuracy to translate whatever could be translated: in Cant. the allegorical motive came into play which is exhibited in the Targum in a still more exaggerated form.[48]

10. In the second place, Aquila's pedantry is revealed in coinages intended to bring out the Hebrew etymology

---

[45] See the list in Index.

[46] The following is a list of such names with their Greek equivalents: Gen. 14. 3, 8 עֵמֶק הַשִּׂדִּים = . . . τῶν πρινεώνων ; 16. 11 יִשְׁמָעֵאל = εἰσακοὴ θεοῦ ; 26. 33 בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע = . . . πλησμονῆς ; 32. 30 (31) פְּנִיאֵל = πρόσωπον ἰσχυροῦ, contrast σ' Φανουήλ ; Num. 21. 1 דֶּרֶךְ הָאֲתָרִים = ὁδὸν τῶν κατασκόπων (but ⑤ 'Αθαρείν) ; Deut. 1. 1 דִּי זָהָב = ἱκανόν . . . (implying דְּי) ; 1 Kings 13. 18 גֵּי הַצֹּבֹעִים = φάραγγα τῶν ὑαινῶν (⑤ and σ' transliterate) ; 2 Kings 5. 9 מִן־הַמִּלֹּוא = (ἀπὸ τοῦ) πληρώματος ; 17. 24 מַחֲנִימָה = (εἰς) παρεμβολάς (⑤ εἰς Μαναΐμ) ; Cant. 6. 3 (4) כְּתִרְצָה = κατ' εὐδοκίαν ; 6. 12 (7. 1) ; 7. 1 (2) שׁוּלַמִּית = εἰρηνεύουσα (⑤ Σουναμῖτις) : 7. 4 (5) בְּחֶשְׁבּוֹן = ἐν ἐπιλογισμῷ (⑤ ἐν 'Εσεβών) ; ibid., דַּמֶּשֶׂק = ἀποβλήτων (⑤ Δαμασκοῦ), on which see below ; Isa. 16. 7 קִיר חֲרֶשֶׂת = τοίχος ὀστράκου ; Jer. 31 (38), 15 בְּרָמָה = ἐν ὑψηλῇ (⑤ ἐν Ραμα) ; 43 (50), 13 בֵּית שֶׁמֶשׁ = οἴκου ἡλίου, contrast ⑤ 'Ηλιουπόλεως ; 50 (27). 21 מְרָתַיִם = παραπικραινόντων ; Ezek. 23. 23 פְּקוֹד וְשׁוֹעַ וְקוֹעַ = ἐπισκέπτην, καὶ τύραννον, καὶ κορυφαῖον, contrast ⑤ σ' θ' Φακοὺκ (Φακοὺδ), καὶ Σουέ, καὶ Τχουέ (Κουέ) ; Hos. 5. 1 לְמִצְפָּה = τῇ σκοπεύσει ; 6. 9 שֶׁכְמָה = humeros (quoted by Jerome) ; Zech. 2. 5 גּוֹי כְּרֵתִים = ἔθνος ὀλέθριον (⑤ πάροικοι Κρητῶν).

[47] The subject is dealt with by A. Deissmann in a monograph ' Die Hellenisierung des semitischen Monotheismus', in *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, 1903, 161-77.

[48] Thus כנשתא ⑉ הַשּׁוּלַמִּית ; בזמן דצבותך למעבד רעותי ⑉ כְּתִרְצָה ; וידעין לממני הושבני עבורין ומעברין שנין וקבעין רישי ⑉ בְּחֶשְׁבּוֹן ; דישראל ירחין ורישי שנין.

which, as the case may be, is either real or imaginary.
Thus, in addition to the standard example adduced above,[49]
the following instances are instructive:[50] ἀγνόημα being the
equivalent of either מְשׁוּגָה or שִׁגָּיוֹן, ἀγνοηματίζειν is formed
to render הִשְׁגָּה; ἄλαλος being used for אִלֵּם, ἀλαλεῖν and
ἀλαλοῦν pass. are coined for נֶאֱלַם; ἀλοιφή = כֹּפֶר, hence
ἀλοιφᾶν = כָּפַר; ἀναβόλαιον is a's word for מַעֲטֶה, and in
conformity with it he renders עָטָה and הֶעְטָה by ἀναβολεῖσθαι;
ἀνόητος = כְּסִיל, hence ἀνοητίζειν pass. = כָּסַל; ἀνυπερθεσία =
עֶבְרָה, ἀνυπερθετεῖν = הִתְעַבֵּר; ἀσύνετος = בַּעַר, ἀσυνετίζεσθαι =
בָּעַר; ἀφημένον = נָגַע from ἀφή = נֶגַע; βελτιοῦν or βελ-
τύνειν = הֵיטִיב from βελτίον = טוֹב; βρωματίζειν = הַאֲכִיל from
βρῶμα = אֹכֶל or מַאֲכָל; διαβηματίζειν = צָעַד from διάβημα
= צַעַד or צְעָדָה; διαδηματίζεσθαι = כָּתַר with a view to διά-
δημα = כֶּתֶר; ἐκλεκτοῦν pass. = בָּרַר niph. and ἐκλεκτῶς = בַּר
acc. with reference to ἐκλεκτός = נָבָר and ἐκλεκτόν = בַּר
(corn); ἐπιστήμων = מַשְׂכִּיל, ἐπιστημοῦν = הִשְׂכִּיל; εὐζωνία = גַּד,
εὐζωνίζειν = גָּדַד; εὐπρεπής for נָעִים gave rise to εὐπρεπεῖν
or εὐπρεποῦν for נָעֵם, similarly εὐπρεπίζειν pass. for נָעֵם;
θυρεοῦν for גָּנַן arose from θυρεός = מָגֵן; κατάρροια pl. = נֹזְלִים
from καταρρεῖν = נָזַל; λαιλαπίζειν = שָׂעַר from λαῖλαψ = סְעָרָה
or סַעַר; λεπτόν = דַּק from λεπτός = דַּק; λιθολογεῖσθαι =
הָיָה עַיִין from λιθολογία = עַיִים; μοναχοῦν = יָחֵד from μοναχός =
יָחִיד; ὀρνίζειν = צִפְצֵף from ὄρνεον = צִפּוֹר; ὀστέϊνος = עֲצוּם,
ὀστέωσις = עָצְמָה, and ὀστόϊνος again = עָצוּם are all due to ὀστέον
or ὀστοῦν = עֶצֶם; ὀχλάζειν = הָמָה comes from ὄχλος = הָמוֹן;
παραπληκτεύεσθαι = הִשְׁתַּגֵּעַ from παραπληξία = שִׁגָּעוֹן; παρα-
φέρων = יוֹבֵל with an allusion to יָבַל; περίβλεπτα = פְּנִינִים
combined with the root פָּנָה, comp. ⑥ Exod. 2. 12; πρασιά-

ζεσθαι and πρασνοῦσθαι = עֲרֻג owe their origin to πρασιά = עֲרוּגָה; σκανδαλοῦν pass. = בָּשַׁל or נִכְשַׁל is derived from σκάνδαλον = מִכְשׁוֹל; στερεωματίζειν for רָקַע from στερέωμα = רָקִיעַ; σφιγκτήρ = שָׁבָץ because it also renders מִשְׁבְּצֶת; σφοδρότης = מְאֹד subst. from σφόδρα = מְאֹד adv.; ταραχή = רַעַ with an allusion to רָעַע; τενοντοῦν for עָרַף is due to τένων = עֹרֶף; ἡ τιθηνός = מֵינֶקֶת gave rise to τιθηνιζόμενον or τιθιζόμενον or τιτθιζόμενον for יֹנֵק; ὑποσπᾶσθαι for נִשְׁמַט originated ὑποσπασμός for שְׁמִטָּה; χερμαδίζειν for רָגַם is with a view to χερμάς, a large pebble or stone.

11. A mannerism which is paralleled in rabbinic hermeneutics (נוֹטְרִיקוֹן) [51] consists in breaking up a pluri-literal into two elements. Thus Exod. 32. 25 לְשִׁמְצָה = εἰς ὄνομα ῥύπου, i. e. לְשֵׁם צֹאָה; Lev. 2. 14 כַּרְמֶל = ... ἁπαλά or ἁπαλόν pointing to מַל רַךְ [מַל is left unexpressed, as it is covered by גֵרשׁ ἐρικτά s. ἐρικτόν 𝔊. Similarly 23. 14 οἱ λʹ ἁπαλὰ καὶ λεπιστά refers to כַרמֶל—contrast Field. M]; 16. 8 לַעֲזָאזֵל = εἰς τράγον ἀπολυόμενον, i. e. לְעֵז אֹזֵל; 1 Kings 6. 8 בְּאַרְצוֹ = ἐν ὕφει κουρᾶς, i. e. בְּאֶרֶג גֵּז; Job 28. 3 et al. צַלְמָוֶת = σκιὰ θανάτου, i. e. צֵל מָוֶת; Ps. 15 (16). 1 מִכְתָּם = ταπεινόφρονος καὶ ἁπλοῦς (and elsewhere ταπεινὸς τέλειος), i. e. מַךְ תָּם; Eccles. 12. 5 הִתַּחְתִּים = τρόμῳ τρομήσουσιν, i. e. חַת חֵתִים; Isa. 27. 8 בְּסַאְסְאָה = ἐν σάτῳ σάτον, i. e. בְּסְאָה סְאָה; 41. 12 פִּיפִיּוֹת = στόμα στομάτων, i. e. פִּי פִיּוֹת; Hos. 8. 13 הַבְהָבַי = φέρε φέρε, i. e. הַב הַב; [52] Mic. 2. 8 וְאֶתְמוֹל = καὶ συναντιῶ ... where

---

[51] See Middah XXX in the Baraita of R. Jose the Galilean (ed. Katzenellenbogen, pp. 173 ff.); Malbim on Sifra, section וַיִּקְרָא, § קנב.

[52] On צַלְמָוֶת being a compound, comp. Nöldeke in *ZAW.*, XVII (1897), pp. 183 ff. Kautzsch, on the other hand, assumes the reading צַלְמוּת from the stem צלם (Gesenius-Kautzsch²⁸, § 30 r, note).—It is rather strange to find that αʹ, while decomposing components or quadriliterals, failed to do it in the case of אַבְרֵךְ, which, according to Jewish tradition, stands for אָב רַךְ (Gen. r., sect. 90), but which αʹ renders by γονατίζειν (הַבְרֵךְ). Some-

it is evident that he construed it in the sense of וְאֶת־מוּל ;
comp. ⑤, Ibn Ğanaḥ and Rashi who likewise derive it from
מוּל, also Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 777 : *conflatum ex* אֵת,
apud, ad et מוּל, מוּל ; and with him Olshausen, *Gram.*,
p. 435, Böttcher, *Gram.*, I, 136, and Delitzsch, *Prolegomena*,
p. 132.

12. It was clearly Aquila's aim to accommodate the
Greek to the minutest points of the Hebrew idiom. He
imitates the ה locale by Greek post-positive -δε. Thus
Gen. 12. 9 הַנֶּגְבָּה = νότονδε [comp. Joshua 18. 14 لمحدا ؟
= νότου δέ for νότονδε, not recognized by Field. M] ; Exod.
28. 26 בַּיְתָה = οἶκόνδε ; Num. 2. 10 תֵּימָנָה = νότονδε ; 3 Kings
22. 49 אוֹפִירָה = Ὠφείρδε ; 4 Kings 16. 9 קִירָה = Κυρήνηνδε ;
Ps. 67 (68). 7 צְחִיחָה = λεωπετρίανδε ; Ezek. 8. 16 קֵדְמָה = ἀρ-
χηθένδε.[53]   Similarly he renders אַף by καίπερ, while אֵפוֹא
at least once (Isa. 22. 1) = καίπερτοι.

Compound particles are slavishly reproduced so that
no element of the Hebrew is lost in the Greek. Thus
Gen. 2. 8 מִקֶּדֶם = ἀπὸ ἀρχῆθεν ; 18 כְּנֶגְדּוֹ = ὡς κατέναντι αὐτοῦ ;
2 Kings 6. 14 לִפְנֵי = πρὸ προσώπου ; 7. 8 מֵאַחַר = ἀπὸ ὄπισθεν ;
4 Kings 19. 25 לְמֵרָחוֹק = εἰς ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, and לְמִימֵי קֶדֶם = εἰς
ἀπὸ ἡμερῶν ἀρχῆθεν ; 23. 15, 19, 24 וְגַם = καὶ καίγε and 27
מֵעַל פָּנַי = ἀπὸ ἐπὶ προσώπου μου ; Job 9. 29 לָמָּה־זֶּה = εἰς τὶ
τοῦτο, contrast ⑤ διὰ τί ; Jer. 31 (38). 34 לְמִקְּטַנָּם = εἰς ἀπὸ
μικροῦ αὐτῶν ; 42 (49). 8 לְמִקְּטַן = εἰς ἀπὸ μικροῦ ; Exod. 12. 37

---

times he even combines two separate words, as Isa. 2. 20 לַחְפֹּר פֵּרוֹת,
which the Masorah separates but which a′, like most other versions, reads
together, rendering it by ὀρυκτοῖς *sive* ὀρύκταις.

[53] The cases of deviation are usually doubtful. Thus Joshua 5. 1 יָמָּה
= παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν is ascribed to οἱ λ, while תִּרְצָתָה = εἰς τὴν Σαριρὰ
occurs in the well-questioned fourteenth chapter of 3 Kings (ver. 17).—On
the misuse of ה locale in the Samaritan and Septuagint versions, comp.
Frankel, *Vorstudien*, p. 197, notes *l* and *m*.

לְבַד מִן = χωρὶς ἀπό (but jᵐ in BM χωρίς c. genit.). Where Hebrew and Greek constructions do not tally, the Greek is sacrificed to the Hebrew. Thus Gen. I. 5, 8, 10 קְרָא לְ׳ = ἐκάλεσεν τῷ...; I. 28 רְדָה בְּ׳ = ἐπικρατεῖν ἐν; 3 Kings 17. 22 וַיִּשְׁמַע...בְּקוֹל = καὶ ἤκουσε... ἐν φωνῇ; Ps. 26 (27). I מִפְּמִי אִירָא = ἀπὸ τίνος φοβηθῶ; ibid., 12 קָמוּ־בִי = ἀνέστησαν ἐν ἐμοί; Isa. 19. 4 יִמְשָׁל־בָּם = βασιλεύσει ἐν αὐτοῖς. Similarly the Hebrew construction of the positive with מִן in the sense of the comparative or superlative is imitated in the Greek garb. Thus Gen. 3. 2 (1) עָרוּם מִ׳ = πανοῦργος ἀπό; Isa. 7. 13 הַמְעַט מִכֶּם = μήτι ὀλίγον ἀπὸ ὑμῶν.—Distributive constructions are reproduced with utmost fidelity to the Hebrew. Comp., for instance, Lev. 24. 15; Num. I. 4 אִישׁ אִישׁ = ἀνὴρ ἀνήρ; Num. 28. 13 עִשָּׂרוֹן עִשָּׂרוֹן = δέκατον δέκατον; Joshua 3. 12 אִישׁ אֶחָד אִישׁ אֶחָד לַשָּׁבֶט = ἄνδρα ἕνα ⟨ἄνδρα ἕνα⟩ τοῦ σκήπτρου.[54] The Hebrew *pronomen absolutum cum participio* becomes in Greek *pronomen absolutum* + the substantive verb superadded to the present, past, or future tense. Thus Exod. 8. 29 (25) אָנֹכִי יוֹצֵא = εγω ειμι εξερχομαι (BM), contrast 𝔊 ἐγὼ ἐξελεύσομαι; 3 Kings 14. 6 וְאָנֹכִי שָׁלוּחַ = καὶ ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος; Eccles. 11. 5 אֵינְךָ יוֹדֵעַ = οὐκ εἶ σὺ εἰδώς; Jer. 31 (38). 32 וְאָנֹכִי בָּעַלְתִּי בָם = καὶ ἐγώ εἰμι ἐκυρίευσα (αὐτῶν) with which contrast σ' ἐγὼ δὲ κατεῖχον αὐτούς; 33 (40). 9 אָנֹכִי עֹשֶׂה = ἐγώ εἰμι ποιήσω; 38 (45). 26 מַפִּיל־אָנִי = ῥίπτω ἐγώ εἰμι, contrast σ' προσπίπτω. The emphatic Hebrew pronoun is faithfully reproduced. Thus, e. g., Jer. 49. 12 (29. 13) וְאַתָּה הוּא = καὶ σὺ αὐτός. Where a particle is repeated after a conjunction, a free translator might ignore the particle in the sequel; not so Aquila. See, e. g., Gen. I. 4 בֵּין...וּבֵין = μεταξὺ... καὶ μεταξύ. The idiomatic construction כְּ׳...כְּ׳

---

[54] See Field's note. The omission was due to lipography.

is slavishly reproduced, comp. Isa. 24. 2 כַּעֶבֶד כַּאדֹנָיו = ὡς ὁ δοῦλος, ὡς ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ.[55] On the whole Aquila imitates the Hebrew with its co-ordinate constructions.[56] Naturally enough, the Hebrew ethical dative and the retrospective pronoun ('ā'id) in relative clauses are accurately imitated. Examples of the former are: Deut. 1. 40 וְאַתֶּם פְּנוּ לָכֶם = καὶ ὑμεῖς νεύσατε αὐτοῖς; 10. 11 קוּם לְךְ = ἀνάστηθι σαυτῷ (a' apparently read לְךָ); Isa. 40. 9 עֲלִי־לָךְ = ἀνάβηθι σεαυτῇ. As to the 'ā'id comp. Gen. 1. 30 אֲשֶׁר־בּוֹ = ᾧ ἐν αὐτῷ; Exod. 3. 5 אֲשֶׁר . . . עָלָיו = . . . ἐπ' αὐτοῦ; 35. 23 אֲשֶׁר־נִמְצָא אִתּוֹ = ᾧ εὑρέθη σὺν αὐτῷ; Deut. 11. 11 אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם עֹבְרִים שָׁמָּה = οὗ (var. ἥν) ὑμεῖς διέρχεσθε ἐκεῖσε; Ezek. 9. 6 אֲשֶׁר עָלָיו = ἐφ' ὃν ἐπ' αὐτῷ.[57] The same holds good of expletives like זֶה, הִנֵּה, נָא, וַיְהִי, וְהָיָה, and the like which in a free translation might be lost. Particles like אַף, גַּם; אַךְ, רַק are clearly distinguished.[58] The connective particle ו, whether plain or consecutive, is translated by καί. The few cases with δέ should be referred to 𝔊 to which it is peculiar. When our translator does employ δέ it is usually with a strong adversative force. Aquila further imitates the Hebrew in placing or omitting the article [59] and in 'iḍāfeh constructions.

---

[55] Hence Joshua 8. 33 ܝܘܼ ܐܦ̈ܘܣܐܡ ܝܘܼ ܐ ܟܒ ܝܘܼ ܐܘܬܐ Syrohex. margin *sine nomine* probably belongs to a'.

[56] The examples are too numerous to quote; contrast, however, my observations below (Chapter II).

[57] Cases to the contrary, however, are not wanting: thus the ethical dative remains untranslated in Ps. 122 (123). 4 where שָׂבְעָה־לָּהּ = ἐνεπλήσθη, while the 'ā'id is unexpressed in Lev. 21. 21 where אֲשֶׁר בּוֹ = ᾧ ἔστιν and Ps. 40 (41). 10, where אֲשֶׁר־בָּטַחְתִּי בוֹ = ᾧ ἐπεποίθησα. But the omission is rare, and on the whole Margolis is justified in maintaining (comp. ' The Hebrew 'ā'id in the Greek Hexateuch', in *AJSL.*, XXIX, 237 ff.) that in the books investigated by him, Aquila and Theodotion are scrupulous in expressing the 'ā'id in all its forms.

[58] See Hebrew Index, *s. vv.*   [59] See Burkitt, 12 f.

Thus, for instance, Ps. 23 (24). 3 בִּמְקוֹם קָדְשׁוֹ = ἐν τόπῳ
ἁγιάσματος αὐτοῦ, contrast ⑤ ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ αὐτοῦ; Exod. 4.
10 אִישׁ דְּבָרִים = ἀνὴρ ῥημάτων, contrast σ' εὔλαλος; Ps. 13. 17
צִיר אֱמוּנִים = ὅμηρος πίστεως, contrast θ' φύλαξ πιστός.

13. A further instance of literalism is found in Aquila's
tendency to render Hebrew words by similarly sounding
Greek words. To the examples cited by Field (*Prole-
gomena*, p. xxiii)—אֵלוֹן = αὐλών Deut. 11. 30; מְכַרְבֵּר =
καρχαρούμενον 2 Kings 6. 16; לַיִשׁ = λῖς Job 4. 14, &c.—one
is tempted to add קֶרֶשׁ = κέρας Ezek. 27. 6. But the case is
doubtful; Schleusner and Cornill assume that a′ read קַרְנֵךְ.
Possibly, however, a′ merely transliterated the Hebrew
(read κερες?). Comp. κικεων rd. κικαιων for קֵיקָיוֹן Judges
4. 6; I doubt whether the 'Greek form' of which Field
speaks was at all intended. Naturally enough a′ makes
use of Semitic loan-words in the Greek language ante-
dating the Septuagint, like βάτος = בַּת, βύσσος = בּוּץ,
χιτών = כֻּתֹּנֶת, σάββατον = שַׁבָּת (from which the verb σαβ-
βατίζειν = שָׁבַת was probably a coinage current among
Greek-speaking Jews). But the most important evidence
of a singularly painstaking accuracy is Aquila's endeavour
to render, as far as possible, the same Hebrew words by the
same Greek words, or at any rate to minimize the number
of synonymous equivalents. To illustrate this I shall quote
some significant Greek words and contrast the number of
their Hebrew equivalents as used by the Septuagint and
Aquila; of course, we have to bear in mind the fact that
we are comparing an individual translation, extant at that
only in a fragmentary condition, with a work on which a
multiplicity of hands were at work. In the enumeration of
the words I follow the plan of Deissmann (see n. 47), the only
difference being that here they are arranged according to the

alphabet: ἀγαθός 10. α' 1 ; ἄγγελος 15. α' 1 ; ἅγιος 21. α' 1 ;
ἀδικία 36. α' 6 ; ἀνομία 24. α' 3 ; ἀνόμημα 8. α' 1 ; ἀπολλύειν
38. α' 2 ; ἀπώλεια 21. α' 1 ; ἀρχή 24. α' 2 ; ἄρχων 36. α' 3 ;
ἀσέβεια 14. α' 1 ; ἀσεβής 16. α' 1 ; βασιλεία 7. α' 1 ; βασί-
λειον 6. α' 1 ; βασιλεύς 9. α' 1 ; γῆ 15. α' 2 ; γίγνεσθαι 98. α' 3 ;
διδόναι 53. α' 1 ; δόξα 25. α' 4 ; δύναμις 26. α' 3 ; δύνασθαι
14. α' 1 ; δυνάστης 22. α' 1 ; δυνατός 25. α' 3 ; ἔθνος 15. α' 3 ;
εἴδωλον 15. α' 5 ; ἐνισχύειν 14. α' 2 ; ἐξολεθρεύειν 21. α' 2 ;
ἐργάζεσθαι 14. α' 1 ; ἔργον 27. α' 4 ; ἔχειν 59. α' 6 ; ἐχθρός
15. α' 1 ; ἡγεῖσθαι 35. α' 2 ; θεός 10. α' 4 ; ἰσχύειν 24. α' 2 ;
ἰσχυρός 24. α' 5 ; ἰσχύς 27. α' 4 ; καθαρός 18. α' 1 ; κακία
11. α' 1 ; κακός 16. α' 1 ; κύριος 17. α' 5 ; λαός 16. α' 1 ;
παροξύνειν 17. α' 2 ; πλανᾶν 17. α' 3 ; ποιεῖν 118. α' 2 ;
πόλεμος 8. α' 1 ; πόλις 6. α' 2 ; συναγωγή 19. α' 2 ; ταράσσειν
45. α' 5 ; τόπος 12. α' 1.

It must also be noticed that among the words common
to Aquila and the Septuagint there are such as are
used by our translator in a rarer sense than the one in
which they are employed by the Septuagint. Thus τροπή
which stands in 𝕲 for אִיד, חֲלִישָׁה, or מַּכָּה is used by α' for
שַׁחַק Job 37. 18 (but τ. ῥοπάς as in *Auctarium*).

14. The rendering of divine names is a feature not to
be ignored in a Bible translation, and Aquila's treatment
particularly, owing to its rigidity, should be instructive
and interesting. It will be noticed that our translator
adheres also here to his rigorous discipline: the Tetra-
grammaton is transcribed in ancient Hebrew characters
𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄 in all the continuous fragments that have come to
light.[60] When turned into square characters it assumed

---

[60] This is in accord with Origen's statement in his letter to Marcella
(*Opera*, ed. Vallarsi, I, 131 and III, 720): *Nonum est tetragrammum, quod*
ἀνεκφώνητον, i. e. *ineffabile putaverunt quod his literis scribitur Jod, E, Vau, E.*

the shape וֹהוֹי (the waw and yod being designated by the same stroke; see Driver, *Notes on Samuel*[2], p. xxiii). This was then read by the Christian Fathers as Pi Pi in true Greek style.[61]   But that it was really pronounced κύριος [= *ḳere*. M] is attested to by Origen in his comments on Ps. 2. 2: παρὰ δὲ ῞Ελλησι τῇ κύριος ἐκφωνεῖται.[62]   This circumstance may account for the fact that in a great majority of the fragments preserved in Field [the *ḳere*. M] κύριος has taken the place of וֹהוֹי.   At any rate κύριος stands for יהוה (incl. אדני [but once δεσπότης, Ps. 61 (62). 13. M]), while θεός is used for אלהים.   This may be styled a rule, for the few exceptions may be disposed of as either untrustworthy or else conditioned by an external circumstance.   Thus Ps. 76 (77). 2 and 81 (82). 1 we find אֱלֹהִים = κύριος, but it must be borne in mind that in both these cases אלהים occurs twice, and the deviation is probably due to the principle of variation.   Job 27. 8 אלוה = κύριος (quoted by Klostermann), but this quotation bears the signature οἱ λ, and hence may not be α′.   The same is true of Ps. 17 (18). 47, where צור = θεός and the signature is οʹ καὶ πάντες.   There remain Gen. 30. 34, Exod. 4. 24, and Isa. 8. 17, in all of which יהוה = θεός.   But the former is

Comp. also Jerome in the beginning of the *Prologus Galeatus*: *Nomen Domini tetragrammaton in quibusdam graecis voluminibus usque hodie antiquis expressum litteris invenimus.* [α′ is not alone with his transcription of the Tetragrammaton; it occurs in a fragment recently published by Wessely and falsely ascribed by him to α′; it rather belongs to σ′, as has been convincingly proved by Mercati, *RB.*, Nouvelle Série, VIII (1911), 266 ff.   M.]

[61] Comp. Origen, *ibid.*: *Quod quidam non intelligentes propter elementorum similitudinem, quum in Graecis libris repererint, Pi Pi legere consueverunt.*— On the nature and history of וֹהוֹי comp. Nestle, ' Jakob von Edessa über den Schem hammephorasch und andere Gottesnamen ', in *ZDMG.*, XXXII, 466-9, 507.

[62] An additional proof is furnished by Burkitt, *Fragments of the Books of Kings*, p. 16.

probably corrupt: ⅏ 𝔖 α' σ' all point to אלהים as the
reading of the Hebrew archetype, and יהוה is therefore
a later substitute. The best proof for this assumption is
offered by the preceding verse (23) where אלהים is used;
comp. further Wiener, *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*,
Oberlin, 1909, pp. 16–17; also Dahse, *Textkritische
Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage: I. Die Gottesnamen der
Genesis*, Giessen, 1912, p. 42 and elsewhere. [The *lectio
difficilior* is certainly יהוה: θεός of the translations may be
an harmonistic accommodation to verse 23. M.] As to
Exod. 4. 24, which is ascribed to Aquila alone (σ' θ' have
κύριος) it is probably due to the fact that יהוה here in the
mind of the translator rather signified 'the messenger of
God', comp. ⅏ ἄγγελος κυρίου and 𝔗 מלאכא דיי, also b.
Nedarim 32 a where the action is ascribed to שׂטן (var.
אותו מלאך). The reason for the circumlocution is obvious,
as the act appeared unseemly of the Lord. The same may
also be said of the last passage, Isa. 8. 17, which speaks of
the Lord hiding His face from the house of Jacob: owing
to a scrupulous guarding against anthropomorphisms and
anthropopathisms Aquila substituted here θεός for κύριος.
[⅏ has there θεός. M.]

As for the combination אֲדֹנָי יֱהֹוִה, the first element α'
certainly expressed by κύριος (miswritten πιπι Isa. 3. 15).
The second element was probably transcribed by him as
πιπι (= *ketib*), with the intention that it was to be read
θεός. Hence the vacillation of our data (for θεός comp.
Ps. 68 (69). 7). πιπι was, however, through the ignorance
of the copyists, replaced by κυριος. The ascription of
αδωναι κύριος to α' Ezek. 7. 5 rests probably on error.
Ps. 70 (71). 16 σ' certainly and α' probably divided the
combination between the two verse-halves.

שַׁדַּי as a rule is translated ἱκανός, being derived
from דִּי = sufficient in accordance with Ber. r., c. 46, and
b. Ḥagigah 12 a. Only once, Ezek. 1. 24, is it trans-
literated σαδδαι, but this is ascribed collectively to οἱ λ,
while Theodoret records ἱκανός distinctly for α'.

אֵל = ἰσχυρός, and in only a few cases θεός.   In two
instances where אֵל is rendered θεός the ascription is
general: Ps. 67 (68). 25 οἱ λ, and 89 (90). 2 οἱ πάντες.   In
Gen. 16. 11 it is in composition : יִשְׁמָעֵאל = εἰσακοὴ θεοῦ.
Exod. 6. 3 אֵל שַׁדַּי = θεὸς ἱκανός, though bearing the sig-
nature of α', should be doubted and rather ascribed to σ' and
θ' because these two render the same phrase in the same
manner, Ezek. 10. 5, and because the Midrash (Ber. r., c. 46)
registers for α' אכסיום ואנקום which, as will be proved later,
goes back to the Greek ἰσχυρὸς ἱκανός which alone is in
keeping with Aquila's mode of translation.   Indeed it is
more than likely that wherever אֵל שדי = ἰσχυρὸς ἱκανός is
found *sine nomine* (Gen. 43. 14; 48. 13; Exod. 6. 3) it
belongs to Aquila.   Comp. Isa. 8. 10, where α' is credited
distinctly with ἰσχυρός, while the reading of the general
ascription (οἱ γ') is θεός.[63]

As to the article in connexion with divine names,
there is every reason to believe that Aquila adhered to
the Masoretic Text, writing ὁ wherever the Hebrew has
ה and omitting it where the Hebrew omits it.   It is true
that our data offer many discrepancies : the article is used
about 50 times with אלהים, twice each with אלוה and
אל, 25 times with יהוה, and once with יה.   But these
are not to be trusted implicitly, for they are mostly due
to the carelessness of the scribes and a tendency to level

[63] On the treatment of the divine names in the Septuagint, comp.
Frankel, *Einfluss*, pp. 26-30.

Aquila to the diction of the Septuagint. To quote but one example : Gen. 1. 1, 4 as given by Field reads ὁ θεός, while a newly discovered MS. (U₂) quoted by BM offers θεός in both places, quite in accordance with the Hebrew. Comp., furthermore, Gen. 5. 22, 24 where האלהים = ὁ θεός and 41. 6 where אלהים = θεός. It must be maintained therefore that in quoting Aquila (and naturally all the other minor Greek versions) the scribes were concerned only about the chief variants, in our case θεός and κύριος, and paid little or no attention at all to the presence or absence of the definite article.[64]

15. In the preceding I have sought to exemplify Aquila's mannerisms under certain groups. Not everything, however, can be properly classified, especially in view of the fragmentary condition of the extant remains. I therefore subjoin here some longer specimens of Aquila's version contrasted with one or the other of the remaining versions, particularly the Septuagint, so that the reader may have the opportunity of a general impression which will go farther than piecemeal study of detached phrases :

Exod. 4. 10 καίγε ἀπὸ τότε λαλήσαντός σου πρὸς δοῦλόν σου· ὅτι βαρὺς στόματι καὶ βαρὺς γλώσσῃ ἐγώ εἰμι corresponds to גַּם מֵאָז דַּבֶּרְךָ אֶל־עַבְדֶּךָ כִּי כְבַד־פֶּה וּכְבַד לָשׁוֹן אָנֹכִי ; contrast ⅁ οὐδὲ ἀφ' οὗ ἤρξω λαλεῖν τῷ θεράποντί σου· ἰσχνόφωνος καὶ βραδύγλωσσος ἐγώ εἰμι; 19. 18 απο προσωπου ου κατεβη επ αυτου κϛ (BM) for מִפְּנֵי אֲשֶׁר יָרַד עָלָיו יְהֹוָה, contrast ⅁ διὰ τὸ καταβεβηκέναι ἐπ' αὐτὸ τὸν θεόν.

Ps. 45 (46). 1–4 τῷ νικοποιῷ τῶν υἱῶν κορὲ ἐπὶ νεανιοτήτων ᾆσμα ... ἐλπὶς καὶ κράτος βοήθεια ἐν θλίψεσιν εὑρέθη

---

[64] For the method, or rather lack of method, in the use of the definite article with the divine names in the New Testament, comp. Bernhard Weiss, *Der Gebrauch des Artikels bei den Gottesnamen*, Gotha, 1911.

σφόδρα ἐπὶ τούτῳ οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα ἐν τῷ ἀνταλλάσσεσθαι γῆν καὶ ἐν τῷ σφάλλεσθαι ὄρη ἐν καρδίᾳ θαλασσῶν ὀχλάσουσιν ἀντικρωθήσονται ὕδατα αὐτοῦ σεισθήσεται ὄρη ἐν τῇ ὑπερηφανίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἀεί; contrast ⑤ εἰς τὸ τέλος ὑπὲρ τῶν υἱῶν κορὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων ψαλμὸς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν καταφυγὴ καὶ δύναμις βοηθὸς ἐν θλίψεσιν ταῖς εὑρούσαις ἡμᾶς σφόδρα διὰ τοῦτο οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα ἐν τῷ ταράσσεσθαι τὴν γῆν καὶ μετατίθεσθαι ὄρη ἐν καρδίαις θαλασσῶν ἤχησαν καὶ ἐταράχθησαν τὰ ὕδατα αὐτῶν ἐταράχθησαν τὰ ὄρη ἐν τῇ κραταιότητι αὐτοῦ διάψαλμα.

Jer. 52. 1 υἱὸς εἴκοσι καὶ ἑνὸς ἔτους Σεδεκίας for בֶּן־עֶשְׂרִים וְאַחַת שָׁנָה צִדְקִיָּהוּ, contrast σ′ εἴκοσι καὶ ἑνὸς ἐτῶν ἦν Σεδεκίας, similarly θ′, while ⑤ has ὄντος εἰκοστοῦ καὶ ἑνὸς ἔτους Σεδεκίου.

Hos. 11. 1 ὅτι παῖς Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἠγάπησα αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπὸ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου for כִּי נַעַר יִשְׂרָאֵל וָאֹהֲבֵהוּ וּמִמִּצְרַיִם קָרָאתִי לִבְנִי; contrast ⑤ διότι νήπιος Ἰσραὴλ ἐγὼ ἠγάπησα αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ and σ′ ὅτι παῖς Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἠγαπημένος ἐξ Αἰγύπτου κέκληται υἱός μου.

16. In point of pedantic literalness Aquila's version was certainly a *tour de force*. It is this circumstance apparently that elicited the praise of the rabbis who at the same time, it is true, may have had in mind the obliteration of Christian notions from the Scriptures.[65] Barring, however, individual coinages which go a long way to stamping his translation as barbarous, a study of his Greek vocabulary serves to verify the observation of scholars ancient and modern concerning Aquila's fine knowledge of Greek,[66] which is indeed what one would expect of a native Greek who, if we may trust Epiphanius, was related to Emperor Hadrian and entrusted by him

---

[65] See below (Chapter III).

[66] See above, § 8.

with the building of Aelia Capitolina before he abandoned
paganism first for Christianity and then for Judaism.[67]
Thus Aquila's mastery of the Greek language is borne
out by the richness of his vocabulary.   There are some
200 words (or word formations) which none of the other
versions nor any other Greek author uses.   A few, how-
ever, disappear from the list when Herwerden's *Lexicon
Suppletorium* is consulted.   While some of the formations
are apparently Aquila's own coinages, there remain enough
to warrant the supposition that he obtained them from
some nook or corner which our sources fail to lay bare.
Aquila is fond of formations with -ίζειν (31) and -οῦν (20).

---

[67] Aquila is first mentioned in Irenaeus, *adv. haeres.* (quoted in Greek by
Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* V, 8, 10).   But it was not before Epiphanius that an
attempt was made to record his life (*de mens. et pond.* 14–15).   Epiphanius's
story is repeated by the Pseudo-Athanasian author of *Synopsis script. sacr.*,
c. 77, and in the *Dialogue between Timothy and Aquila* (*Anecdota Oxon.*,
class. ser., pt. VIII).—The chief Jewish sources are, Pal. Megillah 71 c, l. 10 :
תירגם עקילס הגר התורה לפני ר׳ אליעור ולפני ר׳ יהושע וקילסו אותו ואמרו
לו יפיפית מבני אדם, and Pal. Kiddushin 59 a, l. 10 : תירגם עקילס הגר
לפני ר׳ עקיבה.   A detailed account of Jewish sources is found first in
Azariah dei Rossi's מאור עינים, c. 45 ; more complete is Zunz, *Die gottes-
dienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 82 f. ; comp. also the monographs of Anger,
*De Onkelo, Chaldaico, quem ferunt, Pentateuchi paraphraste, et quid ei rationis
intercedat cum Akila, Graeco Veteris Testamenti interprete.* Part I, *De Akila*,
1845 ; Friedmann, *Onkelos u. Akylas*, 1896 ; also Krauss, ' Akylas der
Proselyt ', in *Festschrift z. achtzigsten Geburtstage M. Steinschneider's*, Germ.
div., pp. 148 ff.—A general treatment of Aquila is found in Hody, *De bib-
liorum textibus*, 573–8 ; Carpzov, *Critica Sacra Vet. Test.*, 1728, 553–60 ;
Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden* IV², pp. 437 ff. ; Joel, *Blicke in die Religions-
geschichte*, pp. 43 ff. ; Bleek-Wellhausen, *Einleitung ins A. T.*, § 281 ; Buhl,
Kanon u. Text des A. T., pp. 150–55 ; Swete, *Introduction to the O. T. in
Greek*, pp. 31–42 ; and finally Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im
Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, III⁴, 435–9.—On the relation to Onkelos see also
Luzzatto, *Oheb Ger*, 1830 ; Rapoport, in a series of letters to the latter
(comp. זכרון לאחרונים, ed. Harkavy, pp. 24 ff. and 56 ff.) ; Z. Frankel in
his works on the Septuagint (*Vorstudien* and *Einfluss*).

As to nouns the suffixes -μός (24), -τής (17), -σις (17), and -μα (16) are met with abundantly. By far the greatest number of the new or peculiar formations[68] consists of compounds with one or two prepositions. Then some 300 words are employed by Aquila alone among the translators of the Scriptures, but are met with elsewhere in Greek. With the other two Aquila shares 74 words not found in the Septuagint, with Symmachus 99, with Theodotion 43, with Quinta 3, with Sexta 5. The lists are given in full in Appendix I.

17. Despite his extreme literalness Aquila not rarely indulges in free translation and paraphrase, if only such Aquila readings really belong to him. Thus Gen. 30. 8 נַפְתּוּלֵי אֱלֹהִים נִפְתַּלְתִּי = συνανέστρεψέν με ὁ θεὸς συναναστροφήν; ver. 42 וּבְהַעֲטִיף הַצֹּאן = καὶ ἐν δευτερογόνοις . . .; 31. 41 עֲשֶׂרֶת מֹנִים = δεκάκις ἀριθμόν, contrast ver. 7 δέκα ἀριθμούς; 42. 21 אֲשֵׁמִים = ἐν πλημμελίᾳ; 49. 4 פַּחַז כַּמַּיִם = ἐθάμβευσας ὡς ὕδωρ, it is not necessary to follow old commentators in presupposing פָּחַתָּ (comp. Field, note), it is simply a free rendering; Exod. 13. 20 בְּאֵתָם בִּקְצֵה הַמִּדְבָּר = εἰς ηθαν (l. ηθαμ) τὴν ἐρημοτάτην; Deut. 8. 14 וְרָם לְבָבֶךָ = καὶ ὑψωθῇς τῇ καρδίᾳ σου; Job 5. 21 מִשּׁוֹד כִּי יָבוֹא = ἀπὸ προνομῆς ἐπερχομένων; 12. 2 וְעִמָּכֶם תָּמוּת חָכְמָה = καὶ σὺν ὑμῖν τελειώματα σοφίας, nomen pro verbo, unless the translator pointed תְּמוֹת (pl. of תְּמָה), comp., however, Isa. 59. 19 where רוּחַ יְהוָה נֹסְסָה בוֹ = πνεῦμα κυρίου σύσσημον ἐν αὐτῷ; 15. 20 מְתַחוֹלֵל = ἐν ὀδύνῃ; 35. 11 וּמֵעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם יְחַכְּמֵנוּ = καὶ σοφίζει ἡμᾶς ὑπὲρ τὰ

---

[68] It becomes evident how precarious are the arguments for a Greek original, say of the Book of Wisdom, based on the presence of compounds in a large number. Contrast J. Freudenthal, 'What is the Original Language of the Wisdom of Solomon?' in *JQR*., III, 722 ff., and A. T. S. Goodrick, *The Book of Wisdom*. London, 1913, p. 68.

κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα διϊπτάμενα πετεινά (a' θ'); Prov. 8. 18 הוֹן עָתֵק =
ὕπαρξις μετ' εἰρήνης, but θ' ὕπαρξις παλαιά and σ' βίος παλαιός;
Eccles. 12. 4 כָּל־בְּנוֹת הַשִּׁיר = πάντα τὰ τῆς ᾠδῆς while ⑤ has
αἱ θυγατέρες; Isa. 29. 1 קִרְיַת חָנָה דָוִד = πολίχνη βιοτεύσεως (or
παρεμβλήσεως) Δαυίδ; 42. 9 בְּטֶרֶם תִּצְמַחְנָה = (πρὸ τοῦ) ἀνα-
φυῆναι; 59. 18 בַּעַל יְשַׁלֵּם חֵמָה לְצָרָיו = ὡς ἐπὶ ἀποδώσει χόλου
τοῖς θλίβουσιν; 62. 6 אַל־דֳּמִי לָכֶם = μὴ ἡσυχάσητε (a' σ' θ');
Jer. 11. 20 נִקְמָתְךָ מֵהֶם = τὴν κόλασιν ὑπὸ σοῦ ἐξ αὐτῶν; 21. 2
נִלְחָם עָלֵינוּ = πολεμεῖ ἡμᾶς, with which contrast ⑤ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς
and σ' πρὸς ἡμᾶς; 26 (33). 18 הַמּוֹרַשְׁתִּי = υἱὸς Μωρασθαί, while
⑤ has ὁ Μωραθίτης; 32 (39). 40 אֲשֶׁר לֹא־אָשׁוּב = τοῦ μὴ
ἀποστραφῆναι με; 38 (45). 27 כִּי לֹא־נִשְׁמַע הַדָּבָר = ὅτι οὐκ
ἤκουσαν τὸ ῥῆμα, contrast σ' ἠκούσθη ὁ λόγος; 51 (28). 17
נִבְעַר כָּל־אָדָם מִדַּעַת = ἐμωράνθη πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ὥστε μὴ γι-
νώσκειν, but ⑤ ἀπὸ γνώσεως; Ezek. 17. 6 לִפְנוֹת דָּלִיּוֹתָיו אֵלָיו =
ἵνα τετραμμένοι ὦσιν οἱ κλάδοι αὐτῆς πρὸς αὐτόν, contrast ⑤ τοῦ
ἐπιφαίνεσθαι κ.τ.έ.; 20. 8 וַיַּמְרוּ־בִי = ἤλλαξαν τὸ ῥῆμά μου,
contrast ⑤ καὶ ἀπέστησαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ and σ' ἠπείθησαν δέ μοι;
33. 12 לֹא־יִכָּשֶׁל בָּהּ = οὐ μὴ συντρίψῃ αὐτόν; ibid., ver. 22
וְלֹא נֶאֱלַמְתִּי = καὶ οὐκ ἤμην ἄλαλος; 36. 37 אִדָּרֵשׁ = ζήτημα
θήσομαι (a' σ' θ'), but ⑤ ζητηθήσομαι; Hos. 7. 14 כִּי יְיֵלִילוּ =
ἀλλὰ ἀσελγῶς ἐλάλησαν, contrast ⑤ ἀλλ' ἢ ὠλόλυζον; Hab.
3. 14 בְּמִסְתָּר = ἀποκρύφως.

In the above care has been taken not to mention
differences in particles and conjunctions which might be
added or omitted by the copyists. But in order to form
a correct judgement concerning Aquila's manner of transla-
tion it should be borne in mind that sometimes he employs
particles which have no equivalents in the Hebrew in order
to do justice to the Greek idiom. Thus Isa. 45. 23 כִּי
נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי יָצָא = ... εἰ μὴν ἐξελεύσεται (like ⑤); εἰς is supplied
a number of times (comp. Index) where the context

demands it; similarly ἐξ, ἐν, ἐπί, κατά, πρός, ὑπέρ and the like.

Another way of freedom in translation is the rendering of a sing. by a plur. and *vice versa*, where there is no absolute excuse for it, and where the exact equation would not have been a violation of the language into which the translation was made.[69]   Since these cases are noted in their respective places in the Index only a few examples will suffice here.   Thus sing./pl. in nouns are: Deut. 28. 48 וְעָבַדְתָּ אֶת־אֹיְבֶיךָ = ... τῷ ἐχθρῷ σου (α΄ σ΄ θ΄), but ⑤ has pl.; Job 41. 10 עֲטִישֹׁתָיו = πταρμὸς αὐτοῦ; Ps. 131 (132). 6 בִּשְׂדֵי = ἐν χώρᾳ, contrast ⑤ ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις; Isa. 41. 9 מִקְצוֹת = ... τελευταίου, but ⑤ ἀπ᾽ ἄκρων; Jer. 48 (31). 15 וְעָרֶיהָ = καὶ ἡ πόλις αὐτῆς; Dan. 10. 13 מַלְכֵי = βασιλέως.   Sing./pl. in verbs: Jer. 14. 22 מַגְשִׁמִים = ὑετίζων (like ⑤).   Pl./sing. in nouns: Ps. 1. 2 חֶפְצוֹ = βουλήματα αὐτοῦ (α΄ σ΄ ε΄ ς΄), but ⑤ θέλημα; Jer. 10. 7 מַלְכוּתָם = βασιλείαις αὐτῶν; Ezek. 27. 16 סְחֹרְתֵּךְ = ἔμποροί σου, but ⑤ has sing.; Hab. 1. 10 מִשְׂחָק = γελάσματα, but σ΄ γέλως.   In verbs: Prov. 28. 28 יִפָּתֵר = κρυβήσονται; 27. 13 חַבְלֵהוּ = ἐνεχυράσατε αὐτόν; Jer. 9. 10 (9) עֹבֵר = παραπορευομένους; Ezek. 29. 4 תִּדְבָּק = κολληθήσονται.

[69] Of course, it must not be overlooked that many such cases of discrepancy in number may be due to *scriptio defectiva*; comp. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*[2], pp. lxii ff.